N14KBILC UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 22 CR 675 (PGG) 4 v. Telephone Conference 5 LAWRENCE BILLIMEK, ALAN WILLIAMS, 6 Defendants. 7 -----x 8 New York, N.Y. 9 January 4, 2023 11:00 a.m. Before: 10 11 HON. PAUL G. GARDEPHE, 12 District Judge 13 **APPEARANCES** 14 DAMIAN WILLIAMS 15 United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 DANIEL TRACER Assistant United States Attorney 17 TELEMACHUS PHILIP KASULIS 18 COURTNEY DANIELLE MORPHET Attorneys for Defendant Billimek 19 20 DAVID GELFAND JEFFREY H. LICHTMAN 21 JEFFREY B. EINHORN Attorneys for Defendant Williams 22 23 24 25

1	(The Court and all parties appearing telephonically)
2	(Case called)
3	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel for the government, please
4	state your appearance.
5	MR. TRACER: Good morning. This is Daniel Tracer for
6	the government.
7	THE DEPUTY CLERK: And counsel for Lawrence Billimek,
8	please state your appearances.
9	MR. KASULIS: Good morning, your Honor. Tim Kasulis
10	and Courtney Morphet for Mr. Billimek.
11	THE DEPUTY CLERK: And, Mr. Billimek, you're on the
12	line with us, correct?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
14	THE DEPUTY CLERK: And counsel for Alan Williams,
15	please state your appearances.
16	MR. KASULIS: This is Jeffrey Lichtman, and I am with
17	David Gelfand and Jeffrey Einhorn, for Alan Williams. Good
18	morning, your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Good morning.
20	THE DEPUTY CLERK: And, Mr. Williams, you're on the
21	line with us, correct?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.
23	THE COURT: This is our initial conference in a
24	securities fraud action.
25	We are proceeding telephonically today because, as I

understand	it,	Mr.	Billime	ek 1	resid	les	in	Texas	and	Mr.	Williams
resides in	Ore	gon;	hence,	we	are	pro	cee	eding	teler	ohon:	ically.

Mr. Tracer, can you tell me about discovery in this case?

MR. TRACER: Yes, your Honor. We discussed getting that out the door shortly to defense counsel. We have proposed a protective order, which we can submit to your Honor to help move things along.

In terms of what discovery will look like, what it consists of, the majority are phone records and financial records as well as search warrant returns, as well as the search warrants themselves, and those will consist of emails and phone contents. So, it would be a couple of probably hundreds of thousands of records, and we would ask for approximately 30 days to produce that.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Kasulis and Mr. Lichtman, having heard that description of the discovery materials, when do you suggest we speak again?

MR. KASULIS: This is Tim Kasulis for Mr. Billimek.

If it's going to take the government 40 days to get us those materials, your Honor, I would suggest another pretrial conference approximately 90 days out.

THE COURT: What do you say, Mr. Lichtman?

MR. LICHTMAN: That is fine for us as well, Judge.

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Tracer, does that make sense to you? 1 2 MR. TRACER: Yes, your Honor, that would be fine. 3 THE COURT: All right, Mike, we're looking for a date 120 days, approximately, from today for our next conference. 4 5 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Sure. Give me a moment. 6 (Pause) 7 MR. EINHORN: Your Honor, this is Jeffrey Einhorn. One quick thing: Will that conference be telephonic 8 9 as well, due to the location of the defendants? THE COURT: Probably, yes. At this point, I can't 10 11 really anticipate -- you're talking 120 days away. I don't 12 know whether there's going to be anything substantively to 13 discuss 120 days from now, or not. So, the best I can do for 14 you, Mr. Einhorn is to tell you, if we're just talking about 15 scheduling 120 days from now, that conference will proceed telephonically. If we're talking about more substantive 16 matters, then it will likely not proceed telephonically. 17 18 That's really the best I can do. MR. EINHORN: Thank you, your Honor. We can, of 19 20 course, file a letter a few weeks beforehand on the issue. 21 THE COURT: Yes. I think what I'll probably do is ask 22 for a status report from the parties, let's say, a week before

for a status report from the parties, let's say, a week before the next conference, to find out what's been happening. That will shed light on whether the next conference is going to be substantive or not.

In any event, Mike, do you have a date for us?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes, your Honor. So, Thursday,

May 4, noon is available.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Tracer, I know you've sort of described the nature of the discovery materials. Could you give me a better sense of the magnitude of what we're talking about here?

MR. TRACER: Yes, sure.

So, the thing that are going to drive the volume, your Honor, to be frank, are going to be the search warrant materials, so because, as part of this case, we did seize email accounts and phones, I think there will be probably, I would estimate, hundreds of thousands of records there, because of the emails and the contents of the phones, so that will drive the volume.

In terms of the majority of what I would call third-party materials that the government has collected in this case, those consist primarily of phone records and financial records — so, by "financial records," I mean bank records and brokerage records — and those records are probably in the order of, I would say, tens of thousands total records, including sort of the statements, the monthly statements, and things like that.

So, that's our general sense of what it looks like.

THE COURT: All right.

So, based on what I've heard, it seems likely to me that when we speak again on May 4th, it will be more in the nature of a scheduling conference rather than a substantive conference.

So, Mr. Einhorn, you can assume that the May 4th conference will be telephonic.

I am going to ask the parties to send me a status report on, why don't we say, April 21st, to tell me what's been happening in the case, where we are in terms of discovery. And when I do speak with you again on May 4th, I will inquire about whether defense counsel has a sense of whether there will be any pretrial motions in the case.

MR. KASULIS: This is Tim Kasulis for Mr. Billimek, your Honor.

I will be on trial before Judge Liman on that date, but if the conference goes forward on that date, as it sounds it will, and it ends up simply being for scheduling purposes, as your Honor contemplates it may, depending on the scenarios, I'm happy to inform one of my partners, who can appear and will be able to provide dates for the Court's consideration that work from our end. But I wanted to let you know, your Honor, that I may be before Judge Liman in person on that date.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mike, do we have any problem doing it at 12:30?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: No, your Honor, 12:30 is fine as

1 well.

THE COURT: So, why don't we do it at 12:30.

Mr. Kasulis, that way, if you are on trial but you feel the need to be there, it will be at the lunch break.

MR. KASULIS: I appreciate that, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

Someone else, I think, wanted to say something?

MR. TRACER: Yes, your Honor. This is Daniel Tracer
with the U.S. Attorney's Office.

I had one clarification on the discovery. We do intend to get out what I'll call materials that we already have hopefully much sooner than 30 days, maybe this week or next week. There will be a need for probably some rolling production because we are still receiving materials, but as we get those, we will produce those promptly. So, I just want to just be clear about that on the record.

THE COURT: Of course. Does the government wish me to exclude time between now and May 4th?

MR. TRACER: Yes, your Honor. The exclusion of time would be in the interests of justice, to allow the government to produce discovery, and to allow defense counsel to review the discovery, and to allow the parties to discuss any potential pretrial resolutions.

THE COURT: Mr. Kasulis, any objection?

1	MR. KASULIS: No objection, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Mr. Lichtman, any objection cannot?
3	MR. LICHTMAN: No objection, your Honor.
4	THE COURT: I will exclude time between today and
5	May 4, 2023, under the Speedy Trial Act, pursuant to Title 18,
6	United States Code, Section 3161(h)(7)(A), to permit defense
7	counsel to review what I understand to be voluminous discovery
8	materials that the government will be producing, and also for
9	defendants to begin to contemplate whether any pretrial motions
10	will be necessary.
11	I do find that the ends of justice served by the
12	granting of this continuance outweigh the best interests of the
13	public and the defendants in a speedy trial.
14	Mr. Tracer, anything else from the government?
15	MR. TRACER: No, thank you, your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Mr. Kasulis, anything else on behalf of
17	Mr. Billimek?
18	MR. KASULIS: No, thank you, your Honor.
19	THE COURT: And, Mr. Lichtman, anything else on behalf
20	of Mr. Williams?
21	MR. LICHTMAN: Nothing, your Honor.
22	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, all, and good day.
23	COUNSEL: Thank you.
24	MR. TRACER: Thank you, Judge.
25	* * *